

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President and members of the body, I rise to support the Withem amendment. I believe that we should inform the people of what is going on. Many times you kind of forget about when your taxes are due, or anyway I do, and so I think if this list is printed in the paper, especially in the weekly papers which are well read, I think that we ought to print them three times instead of just the one time. I listened to the testimony in the Revenue Committee and we heard the pros and cons of it and I have come to the conclusion that it would be better to print it three times than just one time. I think we need the bill. I think we need Senator Withem's amendment and so I would strongly urge you to support this.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Eret.

SENATOR ERET: Mr. Speaker and members, I rise to oppose the amendment. I was thinking of turning in a bill this year to limit it to one after all the newspapers I had seen last fall. I get...in my district I think I have ten county newspapers and for three weeks running that's all you found was just bundles of paper with these tax listings on them and you know we have people going around saying, save the forests, don't waste paper. Well that certainly is a good indication, a good example of it. I think that Senator Withem's first impression was a good one and I would hope, you know, that we could back him in what his first good idea was here and defeat this amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Withem and then Senator Higgins. Senator Withem, you can use it for closing if you wish to let Higgins go ahead.

SENATOR WITHEM: Very quickly, what I would like to do is thank very much Senators Eret and Vickers for their help, but no thanks, guys. If we stand here and debate this, you're telling me what a great, wonderful idea I had originally, I appreciate that. I enjoy the praise and all the nice things you said about my original idea. Remember, on consent calendar, if we don't get the bill moved, we're not going to have any sort of cost savings. What I've said basically was that it would be maybe a significant cost savings if the bill would have passed in the first place. If we defeat this amendment, there will be no cost savings. If we put this amendment on, there will be some cost savings